

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/814,008	GERHOLD, BRUCE W.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Ehud Gartenberg	3746	

**All Participants:**
**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

 (1) Ehud Gartenberg.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

 (2) Kamron Kelly.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 21 January 2005
**Time:** 11AM
**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

NA

Claims discussed:

1-26

Prior art documents discussed:

NA

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

 \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Agreement was reached on the Examiner's Amendment that put the application in condition of allowance by defining over the prior art of record and more clearly defining the claimed invention. Specific prior art was not discussed, because the case as a whole was well known to both the Attorney and the Examiner, from the parent case.